

Application Serial No. 09/921,401
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

PATENT
Docket: CU-2612

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated June 15, 2005, the Examiner states that Claims 1-34 are pending, Claims 1-3, 9-11 and 20-30 are rejected and Claims 4-8, 12-19 and 31-34 are objected to. By the present Amendment, Applicants amend the claims.

In the Office Action, Claims 4-8, 12-19 and 31-34 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper multiple dependent claim format. The claims have been amended to remove the improper multiple dependencies.

In the Office Action, the claims are objected to for various grammatical informalities. The claims have been amended to correct these errors.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-3 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cook (US 6,786,655). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Nardozi (US 6,636,837) and Vance (US 6,131,874). Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Minamishin (US 6,516,468). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Nardozi, Vance and Minamishin. Claims 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Morba (US 6,381,033). Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Nardozi. The Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverses these rejections.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of Claim 8, including:

"a private information inputting means for inputting the private information of the customer, and the receipt note issuing means issues a receipt note which has a customer identity information which includes the private information input at the private information inputting means,

wherein the backyard printing part including the collation sheet printing means issues the collation sheet which has the customer identity information which includes the private information input at the private information inputting means."

As the rejection points out, Cook discloses an image print service system (kiosk) which has as printers, a local printer and a remote printer, which are connected to a main body that accepts various inputting means such as processed

Application Serial No. 09/921,401
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

PATENT
Docket: CU-2612

negative film, a scanner, storage media and a digital camera. However, Cook fails to show the private information inputting means and the receipt note issuing means which issues a receipt note having customer identity information which includes the input private information, as well as the collation sheet printing means provided to the backyard printing part which issues the collation sheet having customer identity information which includes the input private information.

Further, the kiosk of Cook issues a receipt that has a unique bar code which allows the customer to pay and receive the printed image at a given time. Although the receipt having a unique bar code of Cook will be used for identifying the customer similar to the receipt and collation sheet according to the present invention, the bar code is automatically decided by the kiosk. Therefore, if the customer loses the receipt, the identification of the customer is not possible. In the present invention, since the receipt and the collation sheet has customer identity information which includes the private information input, the identification of the customer is easy even if the receipt is lost.

Therefore, the receipt and collation sheet using the private information input has a clear and advantageous difference over Cook's receipt using a bar code. Thus, the Applicants consider that the subject matter of Claim 1 is also not obvious from Cook, as well as dependent Claims 2-5 and new Claims 35-36.

Regarding independent Claim 9, the rejection insists on the anticipation of the subject matter of this claim, on the basis of Cook's description that when the images are ready to print and the customer does not want to have them printed instantaneously, the image is temporarily stored at the kiosk or printed and stored at an area controlled by the cashier. A receipt having a unique bar code is issued by the kiosk in order to allow the customer to pay and receive the printed images. However, the subject matter of Claim 9 includes a storage means which stores the printed article therein and which is locked with and unlocked with a certification information input by the customer. There is a clear difference between Cook and this claimed invention. Namely, Cook uses the bar code issued by the kiosk, while this invention uses the certification information input by the customer. Further, since this invention uses the certification information input by customer, it is possible, without the clerk's help, to open the locked storage means when receiving the

Application Serial No. 09/921,401
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

PATENT
Docket: CU-2612

printed article. Thus, the subject matter of Claim 9 is not considered anticipated by or obvious from Cook, nor are dependent Claims 10-19.

Regarding independent Claim 20, both Cook and Nardozzi describe kiosks used for photo processing. However, neither of these references is at all concerned about the overall layout of the kiosk being user-friendly or user-accessible. Nardozzi happens to show in the drawings a typical kiosk layout in which the monitor is positioned at an elevated level. However, there is no mention in either of these references to construct the layout of the kiosk so that the monitor is located in front of a user's eyes, nor is there any consideration given for adjustment of the monitor to accommodate users having varying heights. Thus, there is no motivation to combine these references with Vance which teaches a tilting monitor.

Regarding independent Claim 23, the same arguments with regard to Claim 20 apply. The Applicants further consider that if four separate references must be relied upon in making the rejection to this claim, that the combination of various small pieces of these references is not obvious.

Regarding independent Claim 24, Morba discloses cutting the web into desired lengths, providing a variety of formats (sizes) that the images may be printed onto. However, Claim 24 includes displaying an image on a monitor screen, and means for aligning the image within the frame to be printed. Morba does not disclose the features of displaying the image on a monitor and aligning that image within a frame to be printed. Instead, Morba only teaches selecting a desired size paper on which to print an image. Thus, the Applicants consider the rejection overcome.

Furthermore, with regard to dependent Claims 26 and 27, Morba does not disclose the claimed detailed image adjustment means.

With regard to independent Claim 28, and dependent Claims 29 and 30, Nardozzi discloses the monitor positioned at an upper side of the main body. Nardozzi does not disclose the claimed feature of the information terminal table having a display at an upper (top) surface. Thus, the rejections to these claims are also considered overcome.


Application Serial No. 09/921,401
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

PATENT
Docket: CU-2612

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

December 15, 2005
Date



Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613